

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 Helen Mojtehed, |

Case No. 2:23-cv-00402-JCM-DJA

7 Plaintiff,

Order

8 v.

9 Christian Durante d/b/a and a/k/a Durante
Insurance and Financial Services also d/b/a and
10 a/k/a Durante Agency,

11 Defendant.

12 Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to extend discovery deadlines by ninety days. (ECF
13 No. 44). Plaintiff explains that Defendant's lead counsel—Jill Garcia, Esq.—passed away,
14 requiring the rescheduling of certain depositions. (*Id.* at 5). Plaintiff adds that the parties must
15 still resolve certain discovery issues as well. (*Id.*). Defendant filed a limited opposition, not
16 opposing the extension of deadlines, but asking the Court to limit the discovery the parties may
17 conduct during the extended time to that which “was already in progress and/or contemplated by
18 the Parties at the time of Ms. Garcia's passing...” (ECF No. 47 at 1). Plaintiff responds that the
19 parties did not agree to limit discovery as Defendant proposes and asserts that Plaintiff is “owed
20 significant discovery...” (ECF No. 48).

21 Given the parties' disagreement regarding how much discovery remains in this case and
22 the fact that Defendant has not filed a motion for a protective order, the Court declines to limit the
23 scope of the parties' remaining discovery at this stage. However, the Court finds good cause to
24 extend the parties' discovery deadlines. The Court thus grants Plaintiff's motion.

25
26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to extend time (ECF No. 44) is **denied**. The following deadlines shall govern discovery:

Joint pretrial order: July 10, 2024¹

DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Page 2 of 2